

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 4, 2010 has been received and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-16**

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-7 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Scolan (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,729) in view of Kotaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,276,659). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a synchronization unit operable “for communicating to a plurality of other computer nodes in the first network **a sign of the difference** between the first network timing information and the second network timing information.” As explained in the Response to Office Action submitted January 26, 2010, these features are not disclosed by the cited references. The Office responds at page 2 of the Office Action that Le Scolan discloses, at column 15, lines 32-48, that nodes of a network receiving cycle start signals, and that the cycle start signals correspond to the recited “sign of the difference.” However, there is no disclosure that the cycle start signals communicate the sign of the difference between network timing information in any manner. Instead, according to Le Scolan at column 12, lines 51-55, “These cycle start signals contain the **value of the cycle time register CTR** of each cycle master, this value being supplied by the internal clock of the cycle master which serves as a reference for all the nodes located on the bus under consideration.” Thus, Le Scolan discloses communicating a register value to network nodes, while claim 1 provides for communicating a sign of the difference between network timing information. Further, Kotaki does not remedy the deficiencies of Le Scolan. Accordingly the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited features of claim 1 and the similar features recited by claims 7 and 10.

Claims 3-6, 11 and 12 depend from claim 1. Claims 9, 13, and 14 depend from claim 7. Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 10. Accordingly the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at least one feature of each of these dependent

claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1, 7, and 10. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel and non-obvious features.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the above-referenced obviousness rejection and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to establish that Le Scolan and Kotaki disclose or suggest, alone or in combination, each and every limitation of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-16.

## Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-3797.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam Sheehan/

Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146  
LARSON NEWMAN & ABEL, LLP  
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200  
Austin, Texas 78730  
(512) 439-7100 (phone)  
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

6/7/2010

Date